

REMARKS

§112

Claims 43-62 included the term “remote websites”. In the Office Action, it appears that this term is being limited to “Internet providers”. It is improper to read unwritten limitations into the claims. *See, In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 322 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Generally, the words in a claim are “not limited in their meaning to what is shown in the disclosure.” *Ex Parte Oetiker*, 23 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1651 (BPAI 1990). During patent examination, the claims are to be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. *Zletz*, at 321. That means, “the words of the claims must be given their plain meaning unless the applicant has provided a clear definition in the specification.” M.P.E.P. §2111.01 *Plain Meaning* (*citing, Zletz*, at 322). It is respectfully submitted that “remote website” is broader in meaning than the definition given in the Office Action for “Internet provider”. Thus, the construction presented in the Office Action is respectfully traversed.

§103

New claim 63 calls for receiving a communication from a sender, the communication including an audio message and sender identification information, creating a communication that is capable of being sent via the Internet, the created communication including the audio message and sender identification information, and sending the created communication to a local presentation interface and optionally to a remote client.

In some embodiments of the present invention, a personal computer-like appliance may construct a web page and/or compose an email. Further, in some embodiments, the web page and/or email may include a message, such as a voice mail received from a caller, and information identifying the caller such as caller ID. In some instances the email and/or web page may be sent to a remote client via a network. Alternately, they may be sent to a presentation interface on the appliance. Thus, in some embodiments of the present invention, a message such as a voice mail may be retrieved locally at the appliance or remotely from a client.

Quite simply, Swartz fails to disclose an appliance such as a PC like appliance that creates an email and/or a web page that may be accessed locally on the appliance or remotely from a client. That is, Swartz merely discloses conventional web pages that are sent to a subscriber computer from a host. 3:39-59. Thus, the web pages are required to be sent to a

remote client. Further, Swartz fails to disclose that the web pages are sent to a local presentation interface for presentation. None of the other cited references teach or suggest a PC like appliance that performs the method of claim 63. As such, claim 63 and claims dependent thereon are believed to be patentable.

Claims 75-82 are similar to claims 63-70. Thus, for at least the same reasons claims 75-82 are believed to be patentable.

Claim 71 is directed towards an apparatus comprising a composer to compose a communication capable of being sent via the Internet. The composed communication is to include an audio message (from a sender of a communication) and sender identification information. The apparatus also comprises a presentation interface to display the composed communication. Because the cited references fail to disclose such an apparatus, claims 71-74 are believed to be patentable.

In view of these remarks, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 28, 2004



Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Customer No.: 21906